

VZCZCXYZ0000  
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUCNDT #1789/01 2552037  
ZNR UUUUU ZZH  
O 122037Z SEP 06  
FM USMISSION USUN NEW YORK  
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0173  
INFO RUEHGG/UN SECURITY COUNCIL COLLECTIVE IMMEDIATE

UNCLAS USUN NEW YORK 001789

SIPDIS

SIPDIS

FOR IO/UNP:EBROWN, IO/PSC:JSANDAGE AND ISN/CPI:TWUCHTE

E.O. 12958: N/A  
TAGS: [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [AORC](#) [PTER](#) [UNSC](#) [KNNP](#)  
SUBJECT: 1540: RUSSIANS CIRCULATE "COMPROMISE" ON WORK  
PROGRAM

REF: A. KONZET/BROWN/WUCHTE EMAIL-09/08/06

- [1](#)B. USUN 1720
- [1](#)C. USUN 1667
- [1](#)D. USUN 1532
- [1](#)E. USUN 1428
- [1](#)F. STATE 128389
- [1](#)G. STATE 114027

[1](#)1. (U) BEGIN SUMMARY AND ACTION REQUEST: On September 8, the Russian Mission circulated new compromise language for the 1540 Committee's work program (ref A), revising amendments it had presented after blocking adoption of the draft work program on July 27. Russia's new language proposes that the Committee engage in "greater compilation" - rather than analysis -- of information on states' implementation of resolution 1540 (2004). Notably, it reinstates two paragraphs Russia had sought to delete earlier, which task the Committee to undertake further compilation in areas in which its initial examination of reports revealed gaps in information or implementation related to all aspects of the resolution, including expanding the matrix as necessary, and to undertake thematic consideration of the obligations and requirements under resolutions 1540 and 1673, based on compilation by the experts, to identify areas for further work for the Committee. (However, the Russians continue to seek to change all relevant references from "analysis" to "compilation.") Mission seeks instructions, by no later than 10:00 a.m. on Wednesday, September 13, on whether to accept the Russian language. END SUMMARY AND ACTION REQUEST.

[1](#)2. (SBU) Russia has introduced its proposals after series of meetings at both the ambassadorial and experts' level, at which USUN and other delegations urged Russia to find a way to break the impasse (refs B-E). At a P-5 ambassadors' meeting September 5, Russia reiterated its opposition to any language suggesting that the Committee analyze or make value judgments about states' implementation of resolution 1540 (2004), while French PermRep de la Sabliere said France could not accept language tasking the Committee merely to compile information because it would be too weak. Amb. Bolton noted that the Committee's entire purpose was to offer assistance to improve their export controls and cooperation in preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and related delivery systems. He said it seems only logical that states' reports to the Committee must be analyzed so the Committee and its experts have some idea of how to set priorities and where to offer relevant assistance.

[1](#)3. (SBU) Neither the French nor the UK delegations have responded to Russia's latest proposals, but USUN-Legal's September 6 meeting with French and UK experts suggests that Russia's proposals might disappoint the French in particular. At that meeting, French and UK experts stressed that the onus remains on the Russians to propose an acceptable compromise, and France has refused to approve any requests

for the Committee's experts to travel to conferences and other events until the Committee has adopted a suitable work program. At the September 6 meeting, France seemed to have the least flexibility, although the French expert indicated willingness to work with the UK and the U.S. to develop options. To ensure that the Committee can function and produce useful results, both thought the P-5 should reach a "political agreement" to complement any agreement on the work program.

¶4. (SBU) The French expert said the French Mission has been instructed to reject anything in the program of work that does not specifically task the experts to undertake "detailed" work on the means of delivery-related provisions of resolution 1540. France is frustrated that the 1540 experts (Russian expert Victor Slipchenko and Brazilian expert Roque Monteleone-Neto in particular) did little analysis of states' compliance with the means of delivery parts of 1540 during the Committee's first mandate, despite frequent French requests. France is unwilling to allow the experts to continue to sidestep the issue. France also complained that the 1540 experts read 1540 narrowly as an instrument that covers only the requirements of the NPT, the CWC, and the BWC, as well as issues concerning non-state actors. (Note: We understand from another member of the experts' team, who has since moved on, that only Russia and the United States reported on their implementation of the means of delivery portions of UNSCR 1540. End Note.)

¶5. (U) UKUN suggested that the Committee should discuss the means of delivery provisions of UNSCR 1540 this fall before the MTCR briefs the Committee. (Note: The Danes have indicated that the MTCR will ask to brief the Committee sometime later this fall. End Note.)

¶6. (SBU) Otherwise, UKUN and the French also expect that their ambassadors will make regretful comments on the 1540 Committee's inability to reach consensus on a work program when 1540 Committee Chairman and Slovak PermRep Burian briefs the Council on September 28, along with Counter-Terrorism Committee Chairman and Danish PermRep Loj and 1267 Committee Chairman and Argentine PermRep Mayoral. The Committee's current work program expires on Friday, September 15.

¶7. (SBU) Comment: This may not be a matter of finding bridging language with the Russians. We appear to have a fundamental difference of opinion in our approach to the future of the 1540 Committee. The kind of "compilation" that the Russians seek -- and the prohibition on "analysis" -- would lead to a Committee that does not meet our basic objectives. France has taken a strong position that the Committee and its experts must do more than simply compile states' reports, and although the UK appears more ready to compromise, it agrees that the Committee must do more than simply collect information. While Russia remains isolated it may be time, together with the France and the UK, to raise the issue to the political level with the Russians. We believe that an emphasis on the need for "analysis" as a means of directing technical assistance will appeal to the majority of Council members. In the meantime, we should work with France and the UK to find ways to permit the Committee to work productively while avoiding Russia's concerns about "politicizing" its work or turning it into a forum for designating compliant and non-compliant states. End Comment.

BOLTON